DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 135 FL 021 718

AUTHOR Gittman, Elizabeth
TITLE Educational Services and Programs for Limited English Proficient Students in Nassau County, New York.
PUB DATE Oct 93
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association (Ellenville, NY, October 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demography; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Needs; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Limited English Speaking; Program Design; *Public Schools; *Pupil Personnel Services; Regional Characteristics; Remedial Instruction; School Districts; Secondary School Students; Second Language Instruction; *Student Characteristics; Student Placement; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *New York (Nassau County)

ABSTRACT

A survey of 56 Nassau County (New York) school districts elicited information on demographics, assessment, educational records, staffing, program structure, and instructional and support services for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. Programs surveyed included 20 prekindergarten, 53 elementary, 45 middle/junior high school, and 44 senior high school programs. Highlights of the demographics include the following: a total of 6,562 LEP students scoring below the 40th percentile on a standardized English reading test; 7,137 students speaking 40 native languages; 1,863 eligible for free and reduced lunches; 257 students receiving special education services; 343 receiving speech services; and 1,051 receiving remedial reading services. Assessment instruments used for oral English language, reading, and math proficiency were identified, and concerns regarding assessment were revealed. Unavailability of students records was an important issue for some districts, and placement without records was usually done by English proficiency test scores. Districts commonly employed full-time English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) teachers to work with LEP students. Pull-out programs were most typical, especially at the elementary level, with self-contained programs or regular ESL periods used in many other cases. Grouping by test performance and grade level were most common. A variety of services are provided for this population, but more are needed. Extensive data tables are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FL

ED 365 135

Educational Services and Programs for Limited English Proficient Students in Nassau County, New York

ABSTRACT

This study investigated demographics, assessment, educational records, staffing, program structure, and instructional and support services for limited English proficient (LEP) students in Nassau County, New York. Forty different languages were spoken by more than 7,000 LEP students, representing nearly 4% of the school-age population. Districts varied in their use of assessment instruments. Students with limited educational background and/or no prior educational records created unique groups within the LEP population. Staffing for LEP students appeared to be inadequate. Priorities for expansion of services included staff development and training, interpretation and translation, bilingual psychological evaluation, ESL approach, and bilingual educational evaluation. Classroom teachers, pupil personnel staff, school nurses, special teachers, and social service providers were targeted for training and/or technical assistance.

Elizabeth Gittman
Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation
Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) of Nassau County

Paper presented at Northeastern Educational Research Association, Ellenville, New York, October 1993.

FL021718

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gittman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BACKGROUND

Rationale

According to the 1990 United States Census, 6.3 million children ages 5 to 17 did not speak English at home, an increase of 38% since 1980. Five million additional children of immigrants will enter the K-12 system in the 1990s. With more than 150 languages spoken by students nationwide, demographic changes will have a profound effect on future education requirements (Huelskamp, R.M. Phi Delta Kappan: 1993, 718-721). New York was one of five states (the others were Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas) which together accounted for more than 28% of school-age children in the United States (NABE News, 11/15/92). In New York State, there were 168,208 limited-English proficient (LEP) students in 1993, representing an increase of 10,201 students or 6.5% from 1990 (NCBE Forum, March 1993). LEP students comprise approximately 5.5% of the school-age population in New York.

A survey of educational services and programs in Nassau County schools explored local districts' circumstances and needs, provided a means for sharing information, and identified needs for county-wide initiatives.

METHODS

Subjects

A questionnaire was mailed to each Superintendent of Schools of the 56 Nassau County local school districts. The districts provided varying grade levels of educational services including 20 prekindergarten programs, 53 elementary programs, 45 middle school/junior high programs, and 44 senior high programs.

Instrument

The questionnaire elicited information on demographics, assessment, educational records, staffing, program structure, and instructional and support services for LEP students. Responses required local data, check-off responses, and open-ended statements.

Analysis

Responses to items were reported using descriptive statistics. Also, listings of languages delineated LEP registrations within districts.

RESULTS

Response Rate

Fifty-six (56) mailed questionnaires were completed and returned by district personnel for a response rate of 100%. Respondents included directors or coordinators of ESL and LEP programs (29%), administrators of instruction (20%), ESL teachers (18%), administrators of pupil personnel (11%), assistant superintendents (11%), and other administrators (11%) including school principals and administrative assistants.

Demographics

Demographic data included (a) numbers of LEP students by grade levels, (b) languages spoken, and (c) services received.

Numbers of LEP Students

Approximately 90% of the Nassau County districts reported a total of 6,562 LEP students scoring below the 40th percentile on a standardized test of English reading: 189 in prekindergarten, 3,472 in elementary grades, 978 in middle/junior high school, and 1,923 in high school. These figures represented nearly 4% of total elementary and secondary enrollments (based on figures reported in New York State Education Department Public Enrollment and Staff, New York State 1991-92).

Registrations of 100 or more LEP students scoring below the 40th percentile on a standardized test of English reading were reported by nine districts at the elementary level, two districts at the middle-junior high level, and five districts at the high school level.

Languages Spoken

A total of 7,137 LEP students in all grades in Nassau County spoke 40 different languages. Spanish, spoken by 4270 students, was prevalent. Other languages spoken by more than 100 students were Chinese (425), Haitian-Creole (330), Korean (288), Japanese (279), Portuguese (168), Italian (152), Urdu (124), Farsi (119), Hebrew (107), and Hindi (106).

Services Received by LEP Students

Services investigated included free and reduced lunch, special education, speech, and remedial reading.

Free and Reduced Lunch

A total of 1,863 LEP students were eligible for free and reduced lunch in the three-fifths of the districts which reported these data: 979 elementary students, 379 middle/junior high students, and 505 high school students, representing just 1.1% of the elementary and the secondary populations respectively.

More than 100 LEP students were eligible for free and reduced lunch in four districts with elementary-level programs and one district with a high school program.

Special Education

A total of 257 LEP students received special education services in the four-fifths of the districts which reported these data: 162 elementary students, 35 middle/junior high students, and 60 high school students, representing 0.2% and less of the elementary and secondary populations.

Between 10 and 19 LEP students received special education services in three districts with elementary-level programs and one district with a high school program.

Speech

A total of 343 LEP students received speech services in the three-fifths of the districts which reported these data: 160 elementary students, 81 middle/junior students, and 102 high school students, representing 0.2% of the elementary and the secondary populations.

Between 20 and 49 LEP students received speech services in one district with a middle/junior high program and two districts with a high school program.

Remedial Reading

A total of 1,051 LEP students received remedial reading services in the four-fifths of the districts which reported these data: 502 elementary students, 238 middle/junior students, and 311 high school students, representing 0.6% or less of the elementary and secondary populations.

Between 20 and 49 LEP students received remedial reading services in eight districts with elementary programs, one district with a middle/junior high, and three with high school programs.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Oral Language English Proficiency

All 56 districts provided information regarding instruments used to assess LEP students for oral language proficiency. The MACULAITIS was used by more than one-half the districts: two-fifths at the elementary level, one-third at the middle/junior high level, and one-third at the high school level. The Language Assessment Battery (LAB), Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL), Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test (CREST), and Language Assessment Scales (LAS) were used by between one-third and one-fifth of districts.

Reading Proficiency

Fifty four districts (96%) provided information regarding instruments used to assess LEP students for reading proficiency. The California Achievement Test (CAT), Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), and Gates-MacGinitie were most commonly used: one-fifth of the districts used each of these instruments at varying grade levels. Next in popularity were the Language Assessment Battery (LAB), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), and Stanford Achievement Tests (SAT) used by slightly more than one-tenth of the districts at varying grade levels. Other instruments used by five or more districts for assessing reading proficiency included the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP), English for Child Placement, and the Stanford Diagnostic Test/Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDT/SDRT).

Math Proficiency

Fifty districts (89%) provided information regarding instruments used to assess LEP students for proficiency in mathematics. The Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Regents Competency Test (RCT), and Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) were used by at least one-fifth of the districts.

The SAT and CTBS were used at varying grade levels; the RCT was used at secondary levels. The California Achievement Test (CAT), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), and Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) were used by six or more districts at varying grade levels.

Concerns Regarding Assessment

Respondents' comments in reply to an open-ended item evidenced concerns regarding assessment of LEP students. Educators at the elementary levels were concerned about validity and accuracy of testing data; difficulty in assessing handicapping conditions and differentiating between language deficiencies and learning disabilities; inappropriate testing of children at the primary grades; and over-testing. Respondents indicated a need to explore assessment instruments and assessment approaches.

Educators at the secondary levels were concerned that test data were inaccurate, inappropriate, and limited; that tests did not adequately identify children with handicapping conditions; that tests did not differentiate between lack of educational background and lack of ability; that students were over-tested; and that it was difficult to determine progress of ESL students in 'covering' curriculum.

EDUCATIONAL RECORDS

Unavailability of Records

Unavailability of records was an important issue for ten districts at the elementary level, eleven districts at the middle/junior/high level, and eight districts at the high school level which did not have prior educational records for 40% or more of their LEP students.

Prior records for 60 to 79% of LEP students were unavailable in five districts at the elementary level, four districts at the middle/junior high level, and three districts at the high school level. Prior records for 80 to 99% of LEP students were unavailable for two districts at the elementary and middle/junior high levels, respectively, and one district at the high school level.

Determination of Placement

When records were unavailable, districts most commonly determined student placements according to English proficiency test scores. Districts determined placements, also, by informal assessment or

according to students' chronological age. Scores on standardized reading tests also were used for placement purposes. These methods of determining placements were not mutually exclusive; districts used more than one method.

Other methods of placement used by five or more districts included ESL teacher evaluations, interviews with parents and students, and BOCES native language testing.

STAFFING

Districts commonly employed full-time ESL instructors to work with LEP students. A reported total of 66 full-time ESL instructors were employed by all the districts for the reported 6,562 LEP students scoring below the 40th percentile on a standardized test of English reading. If these figures are accurate, the ratio of LEP students to full-time ESL instructors was 100:1.

Part-time ESL instructors were the second most commonly employed group with all 56 districts reporting employment of a total of 13.8 part-time ESL instructors.

PROGRAM

Program Structure

Pull-out programs were typical at the elementary level, used by 50 districts (89%). Pull-out programs were used by twenty districts in middle/junior high grades (36%) and fifteen districts at high school grades (27%).

Self-contained programs were used by four districts at the elementary level (7%), twelve districts in middle/junior high grades (21%), and thirteen at high school grades (23%). Regular ESL periods were used by seven districts at the middle-junior high level and at the high school level respectively (14% each).

Student Grouping

LEP students were grouped in differing ways by the various school districts. Methods of grouping were not mutually exclusive, i.e., school districts used multiple methods of grouping.

Grouping students according to their performance on both English proficiency tests and standardized reading tests was the most common approach, utilized by 34 districts with elementary programs (61%), 31 districts with middle/junior high programs (55%), and 32 districts with high school programs (57%).

Grouping students according to their grade levels was the second most common method for grouping students, utilized by 28 elementary programs (50%), 22 middle/junior high programs (39%), and 14 high school programs (25%).

English proficiency tests alone (without additional test scores) and students' individual class schedules were the next most common methods of grouping. Scores from standardized reading tests alone (without additional test scores) were used by the fewest districts: six at the elementary level, five at the middle/junior high school level, and four at the high school level.

Intensity of Service

Intensity of service ranged between 42 and 44 average minutes per week at all levels. Periods per week of service to LEP students (beginners through transitional) ranged from 4-6 periods at the elementary level, 4-9 periods at the middle/junior high level, and 4-11 periods at the high school level.

INSTRUCTIONAL and SUPPORT SERVICES

Services Currently Provided

Local school districts provided services for LEP students. At least one-half of the school districts provided each of the following: ESL classes, special education, guidance counseling, remediation, content area via ESL approach, health education, social worker, and speech therapy.

Nassau BOCES provided various services to districts with LEP students. BOCES provided the following services to one/fourth or more of the districts: bilingual psychological evaluation, bilingual education evaluation, bilingual speech/language evaluation, interpretation and translation, staff development and training, and vocational/technical programs.

Services Needed

Various services emerged as being priorities for expansion or intensification. At least three-fourths of responding districts indicated high or moderate need for the following instructional and support services: staff development and training, interpretation and translation, bilingual psychological evaluation, content area via ESL approach, bilingual educational evaluation, and parent counseling in the native language.

At least one-half of the responding districts indicated high or moderate need for parent education in the native language, guidance counseling, a social worker, parent education, bilingual counseling, bilingual social worker, ESL immersion, bilingual speech/language evaluation, parent counseling, tutoring, ESL classes, summer program, students with limited educational background, remediation, speech therapy native language, language assessment, speech therapy, vocational/technical programs, special education, and program evaluation.

Need for Training and/or Technical Assistance

Classroom teachers were most frequently identified as a target group for training and/or technical assistance (83%). Other groups which responding districts wanted to provide with training and/or technical assistance included pupil personnel staff (guidance counselors and social workers), school nurses, special teachers, social service providers, parents, nonprofessional staff, building-level administrators, teacher assistants, and district-level administrators.

LEP Students with Limited Educational Background

Approximately two-thirds of the districts reported data for LEP students with limited educational background: a total of 603 was comprised of 142 elementary, 111 middle/junior high, and 350 high school students.

Two districts with elementary-level programs, one with a middle/junior high program, and one with a high school program reported from 20 to 49 students with limited educational background. One district reported 160 high school students with limited educational background.

Districts indicated that services and/or programs which would best serve LEP students with limited educational background were staff development, immersion programs, vocational training, reading and literacy programs, and native language library services.

Call for BOCES Services

Approximately two-thirds of responding districts indicated that they wanted Nassau BOCES to facilitate the sharing of successful models and to provide technical assistance and training.

Exemplary programs

Nineteen districts were willing to share their own "exemplary" programs with other local school districts. Exemplary programs covered a range of approaches and methods including whole language curriculum, staff development, coordination between ESL teachers and classroom teachers, tutorial assistance, peer tutoring, summer ESL programs, immersion programs and immersion centers, "core" programs, interdisciplinary programs, remediation, occupational education, mentoring, work-study programs, ESL pull-out, publication of a cultural magazine, bilingual education, a research project conducted by teachers, high school sheltered-English classes, and orientation of high school LEP students to school and community services.

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

LEP students scoring below the 40th percentile on a standardized test of English reading comprised nearly 6,000 students in 1991-92, representing nearly 4% of the Nassau County K-12 student

population and speaking 40 different languages. The universal cooperation of Nassau County local school districts in completing a lengthy questionnaire underscored districts' recognition of their need to serve the growing LEP population. Existing programs of free and reduced lunch, special education, speech, and remedial reading apparently have been insufficient for meeting needs.

Districts' lack of agreement in their choices of assessment instruments and educators' concerns regarding validity of test data suggest a need for exploring assessment issues. This need is particulary urgent in regard to LEP students without prior records and LEP students with limited educational background. Both these unique groups within the LEP population are placed in educational programs by an assortment of methods.

Although districts employed full-time and part-time ESL instructors to teach LEP students in both pull-out and self-contained programs, the total numbers of staff reported appeared inadequate.

Highest priorities for expansion or intensification of instructional and support services for LEP students existed in the areas of staff development and training, interpretation and translation, bilingual psychological evaluation, content area via ESL approach, and bilingual educational evaluation. Numerous districts would welcome training and technical assistance and would share their own exemplary programs with other local school districts.

In view of increasing numbers of LEP students scoring below the 40th percentile on a standardized test of English reading, then, there was necessity for determining procedures for effective assessment and placement, for providing appropriate programs and sufficient staffing, and for expanding needed instructional and support services.

TABLE of TABLES

Table 1 LEP Students by Grade Level

Table 2 Languages Spoken

Table 3 LEP Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch

Table 4 LEP Students in Special Education

Table 5 LEP Students Receiving Speech Services

Table 6 LEP Students Receiving Remedial Reading Services

Table 7 Instruments Used to Assess LEP Students for Oral Language Ab

Table 8 Instruments Used to Assess LEP Students for Reading Ability

Table 9 Instruments Used to Assess LEP Students for Ability in Mathe

Table 10 Percentage of LEP Students For Whom Prior Educational Record

Table 11 Method of Placement When Records Were Unavailable

Table 12 Number of Staff Employed to Work With LEP Students

Table 13 Structure of ESL Programs in Districts

Table 14 Methods of LEP Grouping

Table 15 Minutes Per Week and Periods Per Week of Service to LEP Stud

Table 16 Services Currently Provided To LEP Students

Table 17 Need for Additional or Increased Services To LEP Students

Table 18 Groups Targeted For Training and/or Technical Assistance

Table 19 Students With Limited Educational Background

Table 20 Call for BOCES Services

TABLES

Table 1

LEP Students by Grade Level

No. of Students	Pre-Kindergarten		Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
0	(5)	29%	(0)	0%	(1)	3%	(0)	0%
1-9	(5)	29	(2)	4	(10)	26	(7)	17
10-19	(4)	24	(9)	19	(15)	39	(10)	24
20-49	(2)	12	(20)	42	(6)	16	(13)	31
50-99	(1)	6	(7)	15	(4)	11	(6)	14
100-149	(0)	0	(3)	7	(2)	5	(2)	5
150-199	(0)	0	(1)	2	(0)	0	(1)	3
200-249	(0)	0	(1)	2	(0)	0	(1)	3
250-299	(0)	0	(3)	7	(0)	0	(0)	0
300-399	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	3
400-499	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0
500-599	(0)	0	(1)	2	(0)	0	(0)	0
Sum of students		189		3472		978		1923
Median		6		35		13		26
Total districts	(17)	85%	(48)	91%	(39)	87%	(41)	93%

* Number of districts.

Table 2

Languages Spoken

Language	Number of students	Number of districts	Districts w/ 1-9 studnts	Districts w/ 10-19 studnts	Districts w/ 20-29 studnts	Districts w/ 30-99 studnts	Districts w/ 100 or more studnts
Spanish	4270	55	14	12	2	16	11
Chinese*	425	51	36	11	2	2	0
Haitian-Creole	330	19	14	0	3	1	1
Korean	288	35	27	1	5	2	0
Japanese	279	26	20	2	2	1	1
Portuguese	168	20	17	2	0	0	1
Italian	152	34	29	4	1	0	0
Urdu	124	31	28	2	1	0	0
Farsi	119	21	18	2	1	0	0
Hebrew	107	22	20	1	1	0	0
Hindi	106	30	27	3	0	0	0
Polish	98	29	26	3	0	0	0
Vietnamese	92	25	24	1	0	0	0
Greek	87	30	28	2	0	0	0
Malayalam	76	11	9	0	2	0	0
Russian	64	22	22	0	0	0	0
Turkish	42	17	17	0	0	0	0
Tagalog**	38	15	15	0	0	0	0
Arabic	34	21	21	0	0	0	0
Gujarati	29	13	13	0	0	0	0
Bengali	25	7	7	0	0	0	0
Thai	22	10	10	0	0	0	0
Serbo-Croation***	18	9	9	0	0	0	0
Punjabi	16	6	6	0	0	0	0
French	15	9	9	0	0	0	0
Mandarin	13	3	3	0	0	0	0
English-Creole	10	5	5	0	0	0	0
Czech	9	3	3	0	0	0	0
Romanian	9	7	7	0	0	0	0
Albanian	7	4	4	0	0	0	0
Hungarian	7	4	4	0	0	0	0
Cambodian (Khmer)	6	4	4	0	0	0	0
Cantonese	6	2	2	0	0	0	0
German	4	3	3	0	0	0	0
Persian	4	1	1	0	0	0	0
Armenian	3	2	2	0	0	0	0
Burmese	3	2	2	0	0	0	0
Tamil	3	2	2	0	0	0	0
Yugoslavian****	3	2	2	0	0	0	0
Afghani*****	2	1	1	0	0	0	0

* not specified whether Cantonese or Mandarin

** aka Pilipino including Visayan

*** aka Croation

**** not specified whether Serbo-Croation, Slovenian, or Macedonian

***** not specified whether Dari or Pushto

Table 2 (continued)

Languages Spoken

Language	Number of students	Number of districts	Districts w/ 1-9 studnts	Districts w/ 10-19 studnts	Districts w/ 20-29 studnts	Districts w/ 30-99 studnts	Districts w/ 100 or more studnts
Amharic	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Bulgarian	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Dari	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Finnish	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Pampango	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Pushto	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Arawak	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Danish	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Ilocano	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Indonesian	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Lithuanian	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Sinhalese	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Swahili	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Swedish	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Taiwanese	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Telugu	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tonga	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Twi	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Ukrainian	1	1	1	0	0	0	0

Table 3

LEP Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch

No. of students	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
0	(5)	16%	(7)	25%	(8)	30%
1-9	(14)	44	(13)	47	(9)	34
10-19	(2)	6	(3)	11	(4)	15
20-49	(5)	16	(1)	3	(1)	4
50-99	(2)	6	(4)	14	(4)	15
100-149	(1)	3	(0)	0	(1)	2
150-199	(2)	6	(0)	0	(0)	0
200-299	(1)	3	(0)	0	(0)	0
Sum of students		979		379		505
Median		3		4		5
Total districts	(32)	60%	(28)	62%	(27)	61%

* Number of districts.

Table 4

LEP Students in Special Education

No. of students	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
0	(6)	14%	(15)	47%	(13)	36%
1-9	(35)	81	(17)	53	(22)	62
10-19	(3)	5	(0)	0	(1)	2
Sum of students		162		35		60
Median		2		1		1
Total districts	(44)	83%	(32)	71%	(36)	82%

* Number of districts.

Table 5

LEP Students Receiving Speech Services

No. of students	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
0	(9)	23%	(13)	45%	(18)	60%
1-9	(27)	67	(14)	47	(9)	30
10-19	(4)	10	(1)	4	(1)	3
20-49	(0)	0	(1)	4	(2)	7
Sum of students		160		81		102
Median		3		1		0
Total districts	(40)	75%	(29)	64%	(24)	55%

* Number of districts.

Table 6

LEP Students Receiving Remedial Reading Services

No. of students	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
0	(2)	5%	(1)	3%	(7)	21%
1-9	(22)	53	(27)	78	(16)	47
10-19	(9)	21	(3)	9	(7)	20
20-49	(8)	19	(1)	3	(3)	9
50-99	(1)	2	(1)	3	(1)	3
Sum of students		502		238		311
Median		6		3		5
Total districts	(42)	79%	(35)	78%	(34)	77%

* Number of districts.

Table 7

Instruments Used to Assess LEP Students for Oral Language Ability

Instruments	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High		At any level	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
MACULAITIS	(24)	43%	(20)	36%	(20)	36%	(29)	52%
LAB	(17)	30	(13)	23	(14)	25	(17)	30
BINL	(17)	30	(10)	18	(10)	18	(17)	30
CREST	(3)	5	(7)	13	(12)	21	(15)	27
LAS	(9)	16	(6)	11	(5)	9	(11)	20
Total districts	(53)	100%	(44)	98%	(43)	98%	(56)	100%

* Number of districts.

Table 8

Instruments Used to Assess LEP Students for Reading Ability

Instruments	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High		At any Level	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
CAT	(9)	16%	(9)	16%	(8)	14%	(11)	20%
CTBS	(9)	16	(7)	13	(5)	9	(11)	20
Gates-MacGinitie	(6)	11	(5)	9	(6)	11	(11)	20
LAB	(7)	13	(5)	9	(4)	7	(7)	13
MAT	(7)	13	(7)	13	(5)	9	(7)	13
Stanford	(7)	12	(6)	11	(7)	12	(7)	12
DRP	(5)	9	(4)	7	(4)	7	(5)	9
Eng for Child Placmnt	(5)	9	(2)	4	(1)	2	(5)	9
SDT/SDRT	(5)	9	(5)	9	(3)	5	(5)	9
MACULAITIS	(4)	7	(3)	5	(3)	5	(4)	7
PEP	(4)	7	(1)	2	(1)	2	(4)	7
Crest	(0)	0	(3)	5	(2)	4	(3)	5
ERB	(3)	5	(2)	4	(0)	0	(3)	5
Vane	(3)	5	(0)	0	(0)	0	(3)	5
Iowa	(2)	4	(2)	4	(2)	4	(2)	4
MET	(2)	4	(0)	0	(0)	0	(2)	4
PIAT	(2)	4	(0)	0	(0)	0	(2)	4
Boehm Basic Concepts	(1)	2	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	2
Boston-Cloze	(0)	0	(1)	2	(1)	2	(1)	2
DUVALL	(1)	2	(1)	2	(0)	0	(1)	2
IRL	(1)	2	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	2
Literacy Scale	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	2	(1)	2
Woodcock-Johnson	(1)	2	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	2
Total districts	(48)	91%	(41)	91%	(40)	91%	(54)	96%

* Number of districts.

Table 9

Instruments Used to Assess LEP Students for Ability in Mathematics

Instruments	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High		At any Level	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)	*percentage
SAT	(11)	20%	(7)	13%	(9)	16%	(14)	25%
RCT	(0)	0	(1)	2	(11)	20	(11)	20
CTBS	(8)	14	(6)	11	(4)	7	(11)	20
CAT	(7)	13	(7)	13	(5)	9	(9)	16
MAT	(7)	13	(6)	11	(4)	7	(7)	13
PEP	(4)	7	(1)	2	(0)	0	(6)	11
KEYMATH	(3)	5	(2)	4	(1)	2	(4)	7
ITBS	(5)	9	(4)	7	(3)	6	(4)	7
SDT	(3)	5	(4)	7	(0)	0	(4)	7
District test	(2)	4	(3)	5	(3)	5	(3)	5
ERB	(3)	5	(0)	0	(0)	0	(3)	5
REGENTS	(2)	4	(1)	2	(2)	4	(3)	5
PRET	(0)	0	(1)	2	(0)	0	(1)	2
Total districts	(42)	79%	(34)	76%	(33)	75%	(50)	89%

* Number of districts.

Table 10

Percentage of LEP Students For Whom Prior Educational Records Were Not Available

Percentage of students	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)	percentage	(n)	percentage	(n)	percentage
0%	(2)	5%	(3)	9%	(2)	6%
1-19%	(20)	52	(15)	46	(15)	46
20-39%	(7)	18	(4)	12	(8)	24
40-59%	(3)	7	(5)	15	(4)	12
60-79%	(5)	13	(4)	12	(3)	9
80-99%	(2)	5	(2)	6	(1)	3
Median		15%		15%		15%
Total districts	(39)	74%	(33)	73%	(33)	75%

Table 11

Method of Placement When Records Were Unavailable

Method of placement	(n)*	Percentage
English proficiency test scores	(44)	79%
Informal assessment	(36)	64
Chronological	(35)	63
Standardized reading test scores	(26)	46
Other:		
ESL teacher evaluations	(7)	13
Interviews w/ parents and student	(6)	11
BOCES native language testing	(5)	9
Parental requests	(2)	4
Writing samples native language	(2)	4
Screening by speech/language or reading assessment specialist	(2)	4
Total districts	(50)	98%

* Number of districts.

Table 12

Number of Staff Employed to Work With LEP Students

Staff	(n)*	Elementary	(n)*	Middle/Junior	(n)*	High	(n)*	Sum**
Full-time ESL instructors	(41)	29.3	(25)	12.5	(32)	24.8	(46)	66.6
Part-time ESL instructors	(13)	7.1	(15)	4.9	(12)	1.8	(22)	13.8
Part-time ESL teaching assistants	(5)	3.6	(2)	0.1	(1)	1.1	( )	4.8
Full-time bilingual instructor	(5)	3.5	(3)	0.3	(3)	0.6	(5)	4.4
Full-time ESL teaching assistants	(6)	3.0	(5)	0.7	(5)	0.7	( )	4.4
Full-time bilingual aides	(3)	0.6	(2)	0.3	(2)	1.4	(4)	2.3
Part-time bilingual instructors	(2)	1.5	(1)	0.0	(3)	0.7	(2)	2.2
Part-time ESL aides	(5)	1.5	(4)	0.3	(3)	0.2	(6)	2.0
Volunteers	(2)	0.1	(2)	0.9	(2)	0.9	( )	1.9
Full-time bilingual social psychologists	(3)	0.2	(3)	1.1	(2)	0.2	( )	1.5
Full-time bilingual guidance counselors	(2)	0.4	(4)	0.4	(5)	0.6	(5)	1.4
Part-time bilingual teaching assistants	(2)	0.7	(2)	0.3	(2)	0.3	(2)	1.3
Full-time ESL aides	(4)	0.5	(3)	0.3	(6)	0.5	(6)	1.3
Part-time bilingual aides	(2)	0.3	(2)	0.3	(1)	0.0	( )	0.6
Full-time bilingual social workers	(2)	0.3	(2)	0.1	(2)	0.2	( )	0.6
Part-time bilingual social psychologists	(2)	0.2	(2)	0.1	(2)	0.2	( )	0.5
Part-time bilingual social workers	(2)	0.1	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.1	( )	0.2
Full-time bilingual teacher of speech/hearing handicapped	(2)	0.1	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.0	( )	0.1
Part-time bilingual teacher of speech/hearing handicapped	(1)	0.0	(2)	0.1	(1)	0.0	( )	0.1
Part-time bilingual guidance counselors	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.0
Full-time bilingual teaching assistants	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.0	(1)	0.0	( )	0.0

* Number of districts.

** Sum of staff across grade levels.

Table 13

Structure of ESL Programs in Districts

ESL Program	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
Pull-out	(50)	89%	(20)	36%	(15)	27%
Self-contained	(4)	7	(12)	21	(13)	23
Other						
Regular ESL period	(0)	0	(7)	14	(7)	14
Departmental classes	(0)	0	(2)	4	(3)	6
Programmed	(0)	0	(1)	2	(1)	2
Push-in/immersion	(3)	6	(0)	0	(1)	2
Free-standing	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	2

* Number of districts.

Table 14

Methods of LEP Grouping

Method	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
English proficiency tests & standardized reading tests	(34)	61%	(31)	55%	(32)	57%
Grade levels	(28)	50	(22)	39	(14)	25
English proficiency tests	(18)	32	(19)	34	(17)	30
Students' individual class schedules	(18)	32	(16)	29	(17)	30
Standardized reading tests	(6)	11	(5)	9	(4)	7
Other	(2)	4	(3)	5	(3)	5

* Number of districts.

Table 15

Minutes Per Week and Periods Per Week of Service to LEP Students

Level	Elementary				Middle/Junior				High			
	(n)*	Mean minutes per period	(n)*	Mean periods per week	(n)*	Mean minutes per period	(n)*	Mean periods per week	(n)*	Mean minutes per period	(n)*	Mean periods per week
Beginners	(39)	43	(44)	6	(31)	42	(36)	9	(33)	44	(36)	11
Intermediate	(37)	43	(43)	5	(30)	42	(36)	7	(31)	43	(36)	8
Advanced	(35)	43	(39)	4	(28)	42	(33)	5	(31)	43	(35)	6
Transitional	(30)	44	(30)	4	(22)	44	(25)	4	(22)	43	(26)	4

* Number of districts.

Table 16

Services Currently Provided To LEP Students

Services	In-district		Through BOCES	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
ESL classes	(46)	82%	(3)	5%
Special education	(36)	64	(3)	5
Guidance counseling	(35)	63	(2)	4
Remediation	(35)	63	(1)	2
Content area via ESL approach	(33)	59	(4)	7
Health education	(32)	57	(0)	0
Social worker	(30)	54	(1)	2
Speech therapy	(29)	52	(1)	2
Program evaluation	(27)	48	(4)	7
Interpretation and translation	(27)	48	(17)	30
Students with lmted educational bckgrnd	(25)	45	(1)	2
Staff development and training	(24)	43	(15)	27
Summer program	(23)	41	(4)	7
Parent education	(22)	39	(0)	0
Tutoring	(22)	39	(1)	2
ESL immersion	(20)	36	(4)	7
Parent counseling	(20)	36	(0)	0
High school equivalency	(15)	27	(8)	14
Suicide prevention	(15)	27	(0)	0
Bilingual education evaluation	(14)	25	(24)	43
Vocational/technical programs	(14)	25	(14)	25
Language assessment	(13)	23	(7)	13
Alternative secondary program	(12)	22	(6)	11
Bilingual psychological evaluation	(11)	20	(39)	54
Bilingual speech/language evaluation	(10)	18	(20)	36
Parent counseling native language	(10)	18	(4)	7
Adolescent pregnancy prevention	(9)	16	(5)	9
Bilingual counseling	(7)	13	(1)	2
Prevocational program	(7)	13	(1)	2
Bilingual education	(7)	12	(1)	2
Bilingual social worker	(6)	11	(0)	0
Parent education native language	(5)	9	(3)	5
Speech therapy native language	(4)	7	(3)	6
Vocational assessment	(4)	7	(7)	13
Other	(1)	2	(1)	2

* Number of districts.

Table 17

Need for Additional or Increased Services To LEP Students

Services		Need				
	(n)*	High	Moderate	Low	Mean	sd
Staff development and training	(29)	55%	31%	14%	1.6	.73
Interpretation and translation	(27)	41	48	11	1.7	.67
Bilingual psychological evaluation	(31)	42	42	16	1.7	.73
Content area via ESL approach	(26)	46	35	19	1.7	.78
Parent counseling native language	(22)	54	23	23	1.7	.84
Parent education native language	(20)	60	15	25	1.7	.88
Bilingual education evaluation	(30)	40	40	20	1.8	.76
Guidance counseling	(23)	56	9	35	1.8	.95
Social worker	(25)	41	33	26	1.9	.82
Parent education	(24)	38	33	29	1.9	.83
Bilingual counseling	(19)	36	32	32	1.9	.85
Bilingual social worker	(18)	39	28	33	1.9	.87
ESL immersion	(21)	43	24	33	1.9	.89
Bilingual speech/language evaluation	(28)	32	39	29	2.0	.80
Parent counseling	(21)	29	38	33	2.0	.81
Tutoring	(25)	36	28	36	2.0	.87
ESL classes	(30)	37	24	37	2.0	.87
Summer program	(25)	40	20	40	2.0	.91
Studnts w limited educational bkgrd	(25)	40	16	44	2.0	.94
Remediation	(26)	23	46	31	2.1	.74
Speech therapy native language	(15)	33	20	47	2.1	.92
Language assessment	(18)	10	53	35	2.2	.66
Vocational/technical programs	(21)	19	38	43	2.2	.77
Special education	(26)	23	35	42	2.2	.80
High school equivalency	(19)	21	26	53	2.3	.82
Alternative secondary program	(16)	28	17	56	2.3	.90
Program evaluation	(23)	4	52	44	2.4	.58
Bilingual education	(15)	27	7	66	2.4	.91
Vocational assessment	(15)	0	47	53	2.5	.52
Prevocational program	(16)	6	38	56	2.5	.63
Health education	(18)	17	17	67	2.5	.79
Adolescent pregnancy prevention	(16)	0	38	62	2.6	.50
Suicide prevention	(17)	12	12	76	2.6	.70

* Number of districts.

Table 18

Groups Targeted For Training and/or Technical Assistance

Groups	(n)*	Yes	Not Sure	No
Classroom teachers	(42)	83%	3%	14%
Pupil personnel staff	(38)	76	11	13
School nurses	(33)	64	15	21
Special teachers (art, music, etc.)	(35)	63	17	20
Social service providers	(30)	60	20	20
Parents	(32)	50	16	34
Nonprofessional staff	(32)	50	16	34
Administrators-building level	(41)	49	17	34
Teacher assistants	(29)	48	24	28
Administrators-district level	(37)	46	24	30
Board of Education	(34)	30	30	40
Other community members	(28)	21	25	54

* Number of districts.

Table 19

Students With Limited Educational Background

No. of students	Elementary		Middle/Junior		High	
	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage	(n)*	percentage
0	(14)	40%	(9)	30%	(7)	22%
1-9	(15)	44	(16)	53	(16)	50
10-19	(4)	12	(4)	14	(7)	22
20-49	(2)	4	(1)	3	(1)	3
160	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	0
Sum of students		142		111		350
Median		2		2		5
Total districts	(35)	66%	(30)	67%	(32)	73%

* Number of districts.

Table 20

Call for BOCES Services

Services	(n)	Yes	Not Sure	No
Sharing of successful models	(40)	70%	25%	5%
Technical assistance	(38)	63	32	5
Training assistance	(35)	63	31	6